

### Remarks

Applicant maintains that the rejections are illogical and supported only by improper hindsight for the reasons provided in the previous response. These rejections, per the Office Action dated February 10, 2009, include: claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kayser (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,212) in view of Saleh (U.S. Patent No 4,353,114); claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '212 reference in view of the '114 reference and further in view of Hofmeiseter (U.S. Patent 7,068,942); claims 3, 5-6 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '212 reference in view of the '114 reference and further in view of Balakrishnan (U.S. Patent 6,525,514); claims 4 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '212 reference in view of the '114, '514 and '942 references; claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '212 reference in view of the '114 reference and further in view of the TEA152x family data sheet by Phillips; claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Balakrishnan (U.S. Pat. No. 5,285,369); claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '369 reference in view of Mardiguian (Michael Mardiguian, Controlling Radiated Emissions by Design 78-82, First Edition, Van Nostrand Reinhold 1992). Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

In an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to more expressly clarify that the rectifier is coupled to receive a full-wave AC signal with the AC signal being carried along a first conductive path and a second conductive path, and that the filter includes an element connected along the second conductive path (in series) such that one side of this element is coupled to the AC signal and the other side is coupled to common. This amendment should remove all of the rejections which are based on the '212 reference which teaches away from a full-wave AC signal.

Applicant further notes that, as discussed at the seventh paragraph of Applicant's specification (counting from page 1, line 1), the present invention is explained in terms of nonobviousness evidence with surprising and significant results being discussed in particular. Applicant requests that such important evidence be considered in connection herewith.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No.: 32,122

651-686-6633

(NXPS.537PA)